

F 69
.C97
Copy 1



ADDRESS

TO THE

PEOPLE OF MASSACHUSETTS.



✓
B. R. Curtis

Myro Gales & Son
With the kind regards of
Edward Everett.

This is admirable.

25-10

ADDRESS

TO THE

PEOPLE OF MASSACHUSETTS.

✓

By B. R. Curtis

not the Comptroller

cs 185-1



Wm. H. Hall
of the State of
Massachusetts

F69
C97

Vol. 2. B. 2. 101

TO THE PEOPLE OF MASSACHUSETTS.

THE undersigned, members of the Senate, and House of Representatives, of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, desire to address you on a subject of great public concern. They wish to ask your attention to certain transactions, which have passed under their notice, and which demand your serious consideration.

It is known to you, that, at the election of State officers in November last, the Free Soil and Democratic parties were separate political organizations, having different candidates for Governor, and publicly professing very different political principles. You sent to the Legislature members of each of these political parties, who had theretofore held the distinctive political principles of each, and who were elected because they were known to hold those principles. On the first day of January, the Legislature assembled, and its members, including the persons above referred to, were sworn. On the evening of that day, the Democratic members of the Legislature came together in caucus, at a room in the State House in Boston, and at the same time, and in another room in the same building, the Free Soil members of the Legislature also met in a distinct caucus. Each of these bodies on that evening appointed a committee, to meet and confer in regard to all the offices to be filled by the Legislature.

These committees met for this conference on the evening of January the second, and the Free Soil committee "proposed to *concede* the Governor to the Democrats, *on condition* that the United States Senator for six years should be *conceded* to the Free Soilers." What was intended by "*conceding*" the Governor to the Democrats, was explained by the Free Soil com-

mittee to be this : "The Free Soilers were ready to elect Mr. Boutwell without any pledges whatever ; they were willing to place the government of the State in the hands of the Democracy, asking no pledges for *principles*, measures, or offices." But, at the same time, they had so little confidence in the men to whom the administration of all State affairs would thus be confided, that they thought it necessary to make an explicit declaration, that "they would give no pledges to support his (Gov. Boutwell's) administration, *and would take no responsibility for it ;*" so that they were willing, and then offered, by their votes as members of the Legislature, to confide the whole executive power of the State, with no restriction as to principles, or measures, to a man whom they so distrusted, that they expressly stipulated not to be in any way responsible for anything he might do.

In consideration of this, they required that the United States Senator should be *conceded* to them ; and they went on to explain the meaning of this. It was, that "the Senator, *whoever he might be*, must go to Washington uncommitted to any party, or any set of men ; *he must stand upon the principles publicly recognized by the party with which he acted.*" That is, the Free Soilers were to select a person not yet fixed upon, the Democrats were to elect him, by their votes as members of the Legislature, and he was to act in the Senate of the United States, upon the principles of the Free Soil party, the Democratic party having no right whatever to expect him to act on their political principles.

Such was the bargain proposed by one of these committees to the other ; it was agreed to on the spot by both ; and, as will hereafter be seen, members of those committees, under this bargain, voted for Mr. Sumner, and their votes were necessary to his election. Each committee afterwards reported to its respective constituents, in caucus assembled, the above arrangement to *concede* the Governor to the Democrats and the Senator to the Free-Soilers, and each caucus finally assented thereto. *Subsequently*, Mr. Charles Sumner was selected by the Free Soil caucus, as their candidate for the office of Senator ; his name was sent to the Democratic caucus, and a majority of this body voted to cast their ballots in his favor. Such is a brief statement of this transaction, so far as it relates to the office of Sen-

ator of the United States, as deduced from printed statements made by parties who acted on each committee, and had prominent parts in these affairs.* We have foreborne to say anything of the negotiations about minor offices, desiring to present distinctly the main subject.

The bargain being struck, it remained to execute it. Mr. Boutwell was elected Governor—the Free Soil Members of the Legislature voting for him, in pursuance of their contract. Mr. Sumner was chosen by the Senate to fill the office of Senator of the United States; every Democratic Senator, twelve in number,—except Mr. Beach of Hampden, and one other who was absent,—voting for him, in execution of their compact, and their votes being necessary for his election.

The balloting in the House of Representatives was begun. It was found that certain members of the Democratic party, about ninety in number, voted for him, while others did not do so, and no choice was made. And thereupon, through the newspapers, in private conferences, and by public declarations, the members of the Free Soil party insisted that it was a matter of compact and agreement that the members of the Democratic party would vote for a person to be selected by the Free Soilers, and that Mr. Sumner had been selected by them; that the members of that party who did vote for him, acted in pursuance of a binding contract, the consideration of which had already been paid by placing the State Government in Democratic hands; that they who refused so to vote, were guilty of bad faith; that there was no liberty of choice, but an absolute and perfect obligation, springing from a contract to vote for a person to be selected by the Free Soilers. No matter who might be presented as a candidate for their suffrages—no matter if it should appear, in the course of the contest, that the Democratic votes would elect a man whom every Democrat in Massachusetts would desire to place in the Senate—they were bound, hand and foot, by this bargain: *“that the Free Soil party had a right to the specific performance of the contract, deliberately*

* These statements were signed H. W., and are known to have proceeded from the pen of Henry Wilson, Esq., who fills the office of President of the Senate—C. S., the initials of Caleb Stetson, Esq., a member of the House from Braintree—another statement by Frederic Robinson, Esq., a Senator from Essex—and another, attributed to James S. Whitney, Esq., a member of the House from Conway.

entered into by the Democrats, the consideration for which they had already received."

On the other hand, the Democratic members who refused to vote for Mr. Sumner, denied that they, as individuals, had engaged to vote for him. With this charge of what is called "*bad faith*" we do not meddle. It may be true or false. But it is an issue quite collateral to the main subject. The Free Soilers assert that they bought and paid for *all* the Democratic votes. These members in effect say, the Free Soilers bought and paid for only three quarters of them, and that they themselves were not included in the conveyance. This is very important to the honor and principle of these individuals; but, inasmuch as three quarters, who are admitted on all hands to have been purchased, effected the election of Mr. Sumner, there seems to be no necessity to determine with precision just how many that purchase embraced.

In this position of parties, the balloting was resumed from time to time, and after spending ten days in fruitless attempts to make a choice, a strenuous effort was made by the Whig members of the House to postpone the matter indefinitely. Their desire was to save the valuable time of the Legislature, and to bring the whole subject of the Senatorial election, and the conduct of parties in reference thereto, before the People of the Commonwealth, and allow their judgment to operate decisively thereon. It was known to them that the pendency of this election, and the extraordinary means resorted to by the Free Soil party to carry their candidate, were exercising a most prejudicial effect upon the business of the session; that it hung like a cloud over the minds of members; that it absorbed their thoughts and their time; and that, at no period in the history of the State, had so little public business been transacted in the same length of time. It was their desire to relieve the State from the enormous expense, as well as the hazard of imperfect legislation, which they were convinced must arise from the continuance of this contest; and they thought it due to the People of the State, that they should have the opportunity to make known their will concerning the transactions above detailed, before it should have become too late to make their will felt.

In this effort they failed. The balloting was resumed from time to time; three more days were consumed; and on the

twenty-sixth balloting, Mr. Charles Sumner was declared to have been elected, he having received 193 out of 385 votes, two blank ballots not being counted. It will be observed, that he had precisely the requisite number of votes; and of these, upwards of 80 were thrown by Democratic members, procured by the means stated above. Thus was declared to be elected, as one of the two representatives of the State of Massachusetts in the Senate of the United States, for the term of six years, a man who received less than a majority of the votes of the members present and casting ballots, and who goes there "standing on the publicly professed principles of a party" which had only 111 out of 393 members of the House of Representatives, and whose popular vote at the election in November last was only twenty-seven thousand out of one hundred and twenty thousand votes.

Time was, when it would have been deemed an insult to the instinctive love of right which has characterized the people of this State, to do more than narrate these facts, to bring down on the contrivers and agents of this scheme, the indignation of all decent men. And notwithstanding the prevalence of party spirit, which now so controls men's minds, we do not believe that honest men, any where, can look calmly on this picture, with any sentiment except unmingled disgust.

But the unblushing effrontery with which these contrivances have been avowed, and the arguments, so called, by which their authors have endeavored to defend them, do, in our judgment, render it fit that their true character, and the principles involved therein, should be plainly stated.

We think it due to the fair fame of our State, that such transactions should not go forth to the world in a silence which might be construed into an admission that they are in conformity with the usual principles and conduct of those who are trusted by the people of Massachusetts to make its laws. We think it due to the public morals, that the true character of such acts should not be obscured in any minds, by the miserable sophistries which have been thrown over them. And we therefore crave your candid attention to some considerations which we have to present to you.

The persons who have acted together in the election of Senator, under the bargain above set forth, have called themselves

“The Coalition.” We must be permitted to deny the propriety of the name. A coalition is the union of two parties, for the purpose of carrying one or more measures, *in which they conscientiously agree*. It is concert of action, proceeding from concert of opinion. It is a dangerous experiment, not only as respects the public confidence, but the principles of the two parties; and no coalition known to political history has ever succeeded in retaining, for any considerable time, the confidence of the public.

But this is not a coalition. A compact between two distinct parties, having different political principles, for the purpose of dividing public offices between them,—a compact to do this by electing a man for Governor in whom the one party does not confide, in consideration of electing a man for Senator in whom the other party does not confide, is not a coalition, but a factious conspiracy. And when such a compact is made between those who have merely a delegated authority, held in trust, to be used, under the sanction of an oath, to place in office only those in whom the trustees do confide, *it is a factious conspiracy to violate a public trust, and as such, criminal, not only in morals, but in the law of the land*. It is true, the statute law of the State has not defined this offence, as it has failed to do others. It may be because it was considered by all former Legislatures, that a statute describing and punishing such a transaction would be an impeachment of their honesty, which they would not suffer, as respected themselves, and were unwilling to suppose necessary to the public safety and morals, as might respect future Legislatures. But the common law which pervades society, and enters into the relations of life, both public and private, with its benign, but bracing influence, deems such an abuse of a public trust a misdemeanor, punishable by indictment. And there is high authority that a bargain like this, even when made by single persons, and in reference to subjects of far less public concern than this, is an indictable offence. In the year 1825, a case came before the highest criminal court of one of our sister States, wherein it appeared that A. and B. were justices of the peace, and as such had the right to vote in the county court for certain county officers; that they agreed together, that A. would vote for C. for commissioner, in consideration that B. would vote for D. for clerk; and that they voted in pursuance of that

agreement. The statute of the State, like ours, did not reach the case. But their common law, the same as ours, declared—
 “The defendants were justices of the peace, and as such held
 “an office of high trust and confidence. In that character they
 “were called upon to vote for others, for offices also implying
 “high trust and confidence. Their duty required them to vote
 “in reference only to the merit and qualifications of the offi-
 “cers; and yet, upon the pleadings in this case, it appears that
 “they wickedly and corruptly violated their duty, and betrayed
 “the confidence reposed in them, by voting under the influence
 “of a corrupt bargain, or reciprocal promise, by which they
 “had come under a reciprocal obligation to vote respectively
 “for a particular person, no matter how inferior their qualifica-
 “tions to their competitors. It would seem, then, upon these
 “general principles, that the offence in the information is
 “indictable at the common law.*

This is the manly and clear response of the common law—the inheritance of our fathers and ourselves—not only in that State, but wherever it prevails. And now, what are the differences between that crime and the case we lay before you? The parties to that bargain were electors in the court of a county; the parties to this bargain were electors in the Legislature of Massachusetts. The parties to that bargain were two individuals, and their compact controlled two votes; the parties to this bargain were numerous, and their compact controlled many votes; and every reflecting man must see, that a conspiracy becomes more criminal, the more persons it embraces, and the more power it wields. The parties to that bargain made it “without reference to the qualifications of the candidates;” the parties to this bargain entered into it with an open declaration that one of the candidates was distrusted by one party; and the person who was to be voted for by the other party was not even selected; nothing being known, except that he was not to act on the principles which one of the parties who were to vote for him had long professed to hold dear. The subjects of the bargain in that case were a county clerk and a county commissioner; the subjects of this bargain were the Governor of Massachusetts and one of its Senators in the Congress of the United

* *Commonwealth v. Callaghan and al.*, (2 Virg. Cas. 460).

States. And finally, in that case, it does not appear that the officers voted for by the criminals were actually elected; while in this case it is known that this corrupt agreement made one man Governor, and caused another to be declared elected a Senator in Congress.

Such is the case we lay before you for judgment. But before passing thereon, we request you to notice the grounds which have been relied on in its attempted justification or excuse.

It is alleged that, inasmuch as neither of the three political parties in the Legislature had a majority, it was *necessary* to enter into this compact. To judge of the soundness of this plea, it is only requisite to bear in mind, that Congress does not assemble until the first day of December; that the next session of the Legislature will begin on the seventh day of January; and therefore, if no election of Senator should have been made by this Legislature, the place need be vacant only about thirty days at the beginning of the long session of Congress, when no business of importance is to be expected, especially in the Senate; and out of these thirty days must come the Christmas holidays, during which no business is done. How far these parties were influenced by any idea of *necessity*, may be estimated from the fact, that by their united votes they chose Mr. Rantoul Senator, at a time when he was known to be so distant from home that he did not take his seat in the Senate until fourteen days after his election, and that too at the close of the session, when the Senate was crowded with business of the greatest importance to the country. So far, therefore, as concerns the Senatorial election, the plea of necessity is false in fact. But if it were not so—if the like necessity existed for filling this office, as for organizing the State Government—are the political institutions of Massachusetts such as to impose on those intrusted by the people with the high function of filling these great offices, the *necessity* of making a corrupt bargain, by which one party wilfully surrenders its own convictions, in consideration that another party will commit a like breach of trust? We utterly deny this. We know that emergencies may arise, in which members of the Legislature, finding it impossible to place in office those men whom they believe *best* qualified, may be under a moral necessity to vote for others *who are next best*, in order to have a government. But let it not be lost sight of, for a mo-

ment, *that these delicate and difficult emergencies are precisely the occasions on which every man is specially bound to keep his mind free from all improper biases.* He has a difficult duty to perform, calling for the exercise of all the impartiality and wisdom which he possesses. And when it is whispered in his ear, or impudently proclaimed at a caucus, "Agree to vote for a man not yet known, for Senator of the United States, and we will put your candidate into the chair of State, though we care nothing about him, and do not confide in him,"—who does not know that the tempter speaks to him? And how strange is the reason for listening—that an emergency has arisen, calling for more than ordinary circumspection, and a perfectly cool, clear, and free judgment!

It may be said, by Democratic members, when we learned the name, and found it was Mr. Sumner, we were well enough satisfied with his qualifications. We have satisfactory evidence that this is not true; that not a few Democratic members voted for Mr. Sumner contrary to their own wishes and convictions, and solely because they considered themselves bound by the bargain to do so. But if there are any who can truly say, we were satisfied when we learned his name, the answer is, you had unfitted yourselves to judge. You had already placed yourselves under the influence of a tempting offer, which you had accepted. You had made a bargain and received the consideration, and could no longer bring to the question that upright and unbiased judgment which alone would enable you to do your duty to the State. And when the Free Soil party were brought to the consideration of the question, which of two persons, Mr. Briggs or Mr. Boutwell, was best qualified for the place of Governor, does any man believe they were capable of deciding impartially and justly, when they found that, if they cast their votes for the latter, they could secure the prize of Senatorial power, at which they were so eagerly grasping? No one can believe it. And yet, it is precisely this pressure on the judgment, which renders all bribery illegal and immoral. The essence of the offence of bribery is not in the fact that one man has parted with his money, and another man has got it; nor in the fact that an erroneous decision is made, or vote given. Lord Bacon said he sold justice, and not injustice; and no man gainsayed it. The essence of the crime of giving and taking bribes, consists in the

pressure and strain which are thus made, and intended to be made on the fallible human judgment of one intrusted with authority.

It has happened in this State that the vote of a single man in the Legislature elected the Governor, as the vote of a single man, in this Senatorial election, put an end to the ballotings. Suppose a man to have stood neutral, not being wholly satisfied with either candidate; and a sum of money, or any other temptation, is held out to him to vote for one of them, and he does so. Would you say he was to be held innocent, because, on the whole, he thought the man for whom he at last voted, was best qualified for the place? Would you not say to him, your crime consisted in placing yourself under influences which did not leave you free to judge? We care nothing about your acts or your judgments afterwards; you were corrupted *then*, and deserve punishment therefor.

It has also been suggested, that this was not a corrupt agreement, because no individual who was a party to it received, or had reason to expect, anything from it, to his own proper use. You cannot know that. A bargain with the Democratic party, to put the power of the State into their hands, is a bargain to give them the means to reward their friends, and punish their enemies. How far they who made the bargain expected to profit by it, either by obtaining offices for themselves, or their friends, or connections, or dependents, or by ejecting from office those whom they desired to injure, no man can tell. It is in the recesses of the mind, inscrutable, except to the eye of Him who looks into the heart, that these things lie hid. And this renders such bargains the more dangerous. The statute law can reach a case where money is given or promised. It is susceptible of proof. But nothing but the wise jealousy of the people can afford an effectual remedy for the secret, pervading and powerful influence of hope of benefit, springing up in the hearts of leaders of a political party, when the power of the State is held out to them as an inducement to violate a trust. He, therefore, who seeks to purge this bargain of corruption, by the assertion that the parties to it expected no selfish benefit, asserts what he cannot know to be true, and what in all human probability is false. It is unnecessary to refer to events to prove this. You know it must be so. But if you will watch the

executive appointments made, and which may be made, by this administration, you will see a practical exemplification of this truth.

And let it not be forgotten, that the giver is as guilty as the taker. Let not the Free Soil party lay the flattering unction to their souls, that they are not to be suspected of entertaining any such selfish hopes. They held them out to others; and the tempter is by all men justly considered worse than the tempted.

But the corruption of this bargain does not consist solely in this. Its essence is found, not merely in what was taken, but in what was yielded. It is not merely that the Free Soilers were to have their unnamed man for Senator, but that, *in consideration thereof*, they were to vote for a man for Governor whom they distrusted. It is not merely that the Democrats were to have their man for Governor, but that, *in consideration thereof*, they were to vote for a man for Senator, who, so far as is *even now* known, has but one principle of political action, and that hostile to the long-cherished, and repeatedly and solemnly avowed sentiments and wishes of the Democracy of the State—a man whose only rule of action in the Senate of the United States must be, to create, what every American statesman, from the time of Washington to the present moment, has looked upon as a frightful evil,—a geographical party,—and which the Democracy of Massachusetts, up to the time of this bargain and its execution, had always shown themselves too wise and too patriotic to aid or support;—a man who, from the necessity of the case, by consenting to take this office under and by means of such a bargain, must thereby consent to stand as a receiver of the fruits of a breach of a public trust, and to go into a representative assembly to exhibit there the political principle of a small minority, constituting one of the parties to the bargain, and the want of principle of both the parties by reason of which his election was made. We repeat, it is not merely in what is received, but in what is betrayed, that we must look for the true character of this transaction.

Another ground upon which this bargain has been defended is, that such arrangements are common, and to be expected, in legislative assemblies. If this be so, it is time you knew it, and acted upon it. If it be common in your Legislature, for members to vote against their own convictions of right, in order to

induce other members to vote against their convictions of right, and thus secure to each some selfish or party ends, at the expense of the public—it is time the people of Massachusetts swept out their halls of legislation, and purified them from this corruption. The assertion is a libel on the honesty of the State; and no man will make it, who does not take his own conscious wickedness as the standard by which to measure other men's honor. That such things have been done, we are forced to believe; and the impudence with which this transaction has been proclaimed, does more than all other things known to us, to lead us to fear that their true character is not discerned by weak men, blinded by party spirit. That selfishness, party spirit, rashness, may lead men of loose principles, in the halls of legislation, as elsewhere, to do corrupt and wicked things, we do not doubt. But that they are common, that they have become a usage, that they have passed into a rule, and may be appealed to as a principle, we beg the people of Massachusetts not to believe.

We deliberately assure you, it has not yet become *common* for those whom you select to represent yourselves, so grossly to abuse their trust. And we repel, with indignation, the assumption that they who, by inadvertence, or recklessness, or a passionate love of power, or a blind devotion to party, or any worse motive, have become involved in this immoral and illegal compact, can find an excuse for it in the practices of any legislative assembly known to us. But we feel obliged, not only to say that such conduct finds no excuse in example, but to call on the people of the Commonwealth to bear their testimony against it, however usual it may be asserted to be. It is not uncommon for men to steal, cheat, and lie; but the moral sense of mankind does not permit the frequency of these crimes to be their justification.

And if it were admitted that it is common for members of the Legislature of Massachusetts to enter into bargains like this, it is submitted for your consideration, whether it would not be the more necessary that you should hasten to place thereon the seal of your condemnation. That public morals are essential to public order; that absolute fidelity to public trusts is the only secure basis of republican government; and that no people is safe which passes over in silence even questionable acts of its

servants—are political truths which you have not yet to learn. That it is not lawful to do evil that good may come ; that there is not one rule of right in the capitol, and another by your fire-sides ; that the crooked paths of intriguers and schemers are not safe ways for honest men to travel, no people knows better than yourselves. We ask you to apply these principles to this matter. You have placed us as sentinels upon the watch-towers. We have discerned these things which seem to us to threaten your security and welfare. With an earnest desire to do no injury to any man ; with the judgment wherewith we should be content to be judged ; without passion, but without fear, we have endeavored to do our duty to the Commonwealth and to you, by making known these transactions. You will determine whether your interests are safe in the hands of men who have grasped the offices and power of the State by such means ; and whether you are willing to commend to your children this example as safe to guide their steps.

WILLIAM ASPINWALL.
E. H. KELLOGG.
TAPPAN WENTWORTH.
JAMES H. BRIGGS.
MONROE EMMONS.
S. F. PLIMPTON.
JOHN D. FISKE.
W. A. HAWLEY.
GEO. H. KUHN.
WILLIAM HYDE.
HARRISON GARFIELD.
JAS. M. WILLIAMS.
ELIPHALET JONES.
JOHN BIGELOW.
S. T. FARWELL.
ZENAS WATKINS.
A. B. CRANE.
H. N. BIGELOW.
JUNIUS HALL.
SCATTER COBB.
WILLIAM BARNEY.
CHAS. THEO. RUSSELL.
ISAAC WOODS.
JOHN F. PAYSON.
DAVID LAWRENCE.
EZRA LINCOLN.
SIDNEY BARTLETT.
CHARLES C. NUTTER.
B. R. CURTIS.
JOSEPH P. JOHNSON.
JAMES SOUTHWORTH.
SAMUEL HOOPER.
PALMER MOREY.
NATH. F. SAFFORD.
RALPH SANGER.
JASON REED.
JOSEPH N. BREWER.

ISAAC COBURN.
LEWIS KINNEY.
NATH. SEAVER.
JOSEPH M. WIGHTMAN.
ISAAC CARY.
J. SLEEPER.
F. O. PRINCE.
DANIEL G. WHITE.
HUDSON BATES.
CLEMENT WILLIS.
TISDALE DRAKE.
SAMUEL H. WALLEY.
ALPHEUS NETTLETON.
GARDNER ELDREDGE.
S. A. CHURCHILL.
J. G. FROST.
ETHAN BARNES.
LORENZO GAYLORD.
J. P. PUTNAM.
GEORGE O. BRASTOW.
AUGUSTUS STORY.
BURGESS SALSBUURY.
JUSTIN JONES.
MATTHIAS ELLIS.
LEWIS R. CHESBROUGH.
WILLIAM SCHOULER.
EDWARD SHARP.
EDWARD BROOKS.
BENJAMIN POND.
JAMES M. KEITH.
THOMAS TRASK.
HENRY FOBES.
JOHN L. PLUMMER.
S. H. BATCHELDER.
GEORGE GARDNER.
Z. D. BASSET.
SAMUEL F. COOLIDGE.

JULIUS A. PALMER.
 JOHN ODIN, JR.
 F. SAWYER, JR.
 A. B. MUNROE.
 JAMES DINSMOOR.
 THEODORE DUNN,
 JOHN ANDREWS.
 BENJAMIN CARTWRIGHT.
 FRANCIS D. BARTLETT.
 THOMAS KEMPTON.
 OBED NYE.
 RICHARD A. PALMER.
 RICHARD BORDEN.
 JAMES B. LUTHER.
 HENRY J. GARDNER.
 J. THOMAS STEVENSON.
 LEANDER CROSBY.
 LUCIUS FERRY.
 CHARLES C. BASSETT.
 CHARLES BOARDMAN.
 ELIJAH STEARNS.
 DUDLEY SMITH.
 G. D. LUND.
 THOMAS E. PAYSON.
 MORRIS KNOWLES.
 JEREMIAH COLMAN.
 B. EDWARDS.
 NEHEMIAH BALCH.
 WILLIAM KIMBALL.
 WM. F. NICHOLS.
 MOSES KIMBALL.
 JOSEPH B. F. OSGOOD.
 CHARLES M. RICHARDSON.
 JOHN PORTER.
 JOSEPH B. NYE.
 JOHN H. CLARK.
 THOS. HALL.
 S. M. ALLEN.
 JOHN WELLS.
 SILAS TYLER.
 BENJ. SEAVER.
 WILLIAM C. FOWLER.
 JAMES BALDWIN.
 NATH. S. SIMPKINS.
 NATHAN BARNES.
 EBENEZER FREEMAN.
 JOSIAH SEABURY.

ROBERT MARSH.
 WILLARD PHILLIPS.
 CHAS. HUBBARD.
 ALBERT THORNDIKE.
 GILES S. CHAPIN.
 R. S. DANIELS.
 M. NEWELL.
 JOHN BOYNTON.
 THOS. STODDARD.
 STEPHEN HILLIARD.
 PETER FLETCHER.
 WM. POPE.
 BILLINGS BRIGGS.
 THOS. J. SHELTON.
 JAMES MUNROE.
 PHILIP RUSSELL.
 CALVIN W. CLARK.
 NOAH WELLS.
 CHARLES WOOD.
 STEPHEN L. ARNOLD.
 EPHRAIM TOWER.
 N. B. PICKETT.
 JOHN H. ORR.
 ROBERT L. COLBY.
 OTIS CLAPP.
 GEORGE WHITEMORE.
 ANTHONY LANE.
 HENRY H. FULLER.
 WILLIAM RIPLEY.
 MARTIN KNIGHT.
 THOS. EDWARDS.
 SAMUEL KETTELL.
 JEFFERSON BANCROFT.
 FRANCIS BUSH.
 JOSEPH BEDLOW.
 JOHN MAYNARD.
 HANNIBAL POWERS.
 WM. RIPLEY.
 SETH BEMIS, JR.
 J. H. WILKINS.
 JOSEPH BROWN.
 ISAAC JONES.
 BENJAMIN JAMES.
 WILLIAM EATON.
 L. W. RUGG.
 CHARLES W. CUSHING.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 014 012 866 1 ●